OGC-84-50347 29 March 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR:	Director of Central Intelligence Deputy Director of Central Intelligence Executive Director Deputy Director for Operations Director, Office of Legislative Liaison Chief, International Activities Division/DO	
FROM:	Associate General Counsel Office of General Counsel	STAT
SUBJECT:	Jane Doe v. Central Intelligence Agency, et al. Civil Action No. 83-3306	
granted our motio	ttached Order issued 26 March 1984, the court on for change of venue and transferred this ed States District Court for the Eastern inia.	
2. We conside this litigation.	der this to be a very positive development in ST	AT

Attachment

Approved For Release 2008/10/16 : CIA-RDP90R01370R001101580015-0

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FILED

JANE DOE,

MAR 26 1984

Plaintiff,

JAMES F. DAVEY, Clerk

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY, et al.,

Civil Action No. 83-3306

Defendants.)

ORDER

Defendants have moved to dismiss this action on various grounds, including improper venue. Plaintiff has sued each of the defendants in his official as well as his individual capacity and asserts that venue properly lies in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$1391(e)(1) (1976). This section provides, in relevant part, that actions against the United States or an officer of the United States "may, except as otherwise provided by law, be brought in any judicial district in which (1) a defendant in the action resides . . . "

(H)

As a preliminary matter, \$1391(e) provides for venue in civil actions "in which each defendant is an officer or employee of the United States or any agency thereof acting in his official capacity . . ." Plaintiff should have invoked \$1391(b) insofar as she seeks relief from defendants individually. However, even if she had invoked \$1391(b), venue is proper under that section only "in the judicial district in which all defendants reside or in which the claim arose." Defendants do not all live in the same judicial district and plaintiff does not allege that her cause of action arose in Washington, D.C.

The official residence of defendants is the sole determinant of venue for this action. Relying upon a footnote in Reuben H.

Donnelly Corp. v. F.T.C., 580 F.2d 264, 267 n.4 (7th Cir. 1978),

plaintiff asserts that defendants' official residence is

Washington, D.C. That footnote, however, states merely that "the vast majority of agency heads have their official residences in the District of Columbia . . " Id. The other cases cited by plaintiff are similarly inapposite. Nor is the postal address of the CIA controlling. Cf. Donnell v. National Guard Bureau, 568

F. Supp. 93 (D.D.C. 1983) (no estoppel applied to defendants' use of Washington, D.C. mailing address where no indication of an intent to induce plaintiff to bring suit in the District of Columbia and plaintiff could easily have determined actual address).

Defendants correctly assert that the official residence or headquarters of the CIA is Langley, Virginia, which is located in the Eastern District of Virginia. See, e.g., Stafford v. Briggs, 444 U.S. 527, 544 n.ll (1980); Turbeville v. Casey, 525 F. Supp. 1070, 1072 (D.D.C. 1981); see also 32 C.F.R. \$1900.5 (1983) (headquarters of CIA located in Fairfax County, Virginia).

Accordingly, because venue properly lies in the United
States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, 28

Plaintiff has not asserted that venue is proper in this jurisdiction pursuant to any of the other bases set forth in 28 U.S.C. \$1391(e).

ORDERED that this action shall be and the same hereby is transferred, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$1406(a), to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia; and it is further

ORDERED that the Clerk of this Court transfer the entire record herein, together with a certified copy of this Order, to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, forthwith.

JOYCE HENS GREEN
United States District Judge